DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 423 CE 062 842

AUTHOR Beilke, Jayne; Dacey, Vickie
TITLE Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium, Bloomington, IN.
SPONS AGENCY Indiana State Dept. of Workforce Development, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE 29 Jul 92
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); *Consortia; *Cooperative Programs; High Schools; *Inservice Teacher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; *Technical Education; Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana; *Tech Prep

ABSTRACT

The Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium in Indiana was formed to develop and expand the use of the Tech Prep model adopted by the state to all educational institutions in the region. Involving collaboration among postsecondary institutions, secondary schools, and business and industry within state regions, the consortium design involved three phases: an initial year of planning and development, a second year focusing on establishing curriculum for secondary education, and a final implementation phase. Evaluation of the first phase showed that although the planned 8-month time frame was shortened to 4 months, many of the project's goals were accomplished. Some of the results of evaluation were the following: (1) all secondary schools in Region 10 received an orientation to Tech Prep, site members were identified, and their names entered into a database; (2) six training sessions for teachers and administrators in the region were held, resulting in the dissemination of curriculum and practical information and the development of networks; (3) most teachers and administrators who attended the sessions found them helpful, according to questionnaires returned by participants; and (4) almost all consortium members were supportive of Tech Prep and wished to continue as site team members or coordinators after the first year. (Four appendixes to the report include objectives and a timeline for the planning phase, a session evaluation form, and site team questionnaires. Tables include an organizational chart, enrollment data for consortium schools, and ratings of how goals were met by site team members.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353423

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT-
REGION 10 TECH PREP CONSORTIUM

Prepared by:
Jayne Beilke
Vickie Dacey
July 29, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Beilke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

CE062272

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 3

Introduction 6

PART I
Planning Phase - Organizational Structure 8

PART II
Data Collection and Results 14

PART III
Summary and Recommendations 24

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Year 1: Planning Phase - Objectives and Timeline for Region 10 Consortium 26

APPENDIX B March 27, 1992 Session Evaluation Form 28

APPENDIX C Initial Site Team Questionnaire 29

APPENDIX D Site Team Questionnaire 31

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 Region 10 Organizational Chart 8

TABLE 2 Enrollment Data for Region 10 Consortium Schools 13

TABLE 3 Ratings by Site Team Members to Region 10 Goals - Were They Met? 20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium was developed in response to state and national mandates pertaining to Tech Prep legislation. The Consortium was formed "to further develop and expand the use of the Tech Prep model adopted by the state of Indiana to all educational institutions in the region." (Ricklin, 1991) Involving collaboration among post-secondary institutions, secondary schools, and business and industry within state regions, the goal of the Consortium was to ultimately provide better training and preparation for Indiana students who will enter a technologically-evolving work force. The Consortium design involves three phases: an initial year of planning and development; a second year focusing on establishing curriculum for secondary education; and a final implementation phase.

Evaluation of the first phase (the initial planning year) of the Region 10 Consortium resulted in the following data:

* The Region 10 Tech Prep proposal was developed in August of 1991 and submitted to the Indiana Department of Workforce Development on September 16, 1991. Final approval for the proposal was received on January 17, 1992.
* Calling for collaboration, Region 10 depended on active involvement among Consortium members during site team meetings, regional staff training, and meetings of the Coordinating Council.
* Due to the shortened amount of time available to accomplish Consortium goals during Phase One, some goals and objectives were moved to the 1992-93 year while some committees were collapsed into others (Regional Staff Development Committee became a part of the already active Coordinating Council) to more quickly accomplish planning activities.
* All secondary schools in Region 10 received an orientation to Tech Prep by Bruce Ricklin, the Region 10 Tech Prep Director. Site team members in each secondary school were identified by the site team coordinator and their names were included in a Tech Prep data base.
* Secondary school enrollment data indicates Region 10 schools fall into three categories: those with small enrollments of 450 or less students (Bloomfield, Linton-Stockton, White River Valley, Shakamak); schools with enrollments of between 451 to 1,000 students (Eastern, Edgewood, Mitchell, Owen Valley); and schools with over 1,001 students (Bedford North Lawrence, Bloomington North, Bloomington South, Martinsville).
* The first state planned training session occurred on March 11, 1992 and was titled "Administrative Planning." Facilitated by Bruce Ricklin, the importance of Tech Prep in the state was clarified, the role of secondary administrators was discussed, and concerns and problems were identified.
* The second training session on March 24, 1992 covered organizing local teams and business and industry partners. Seventy percent of the participants completed an evaluation form for the session. Specific findings indicated the following: 76% of the respondents found the training session helpful. The opportunity to meet with other team members was helpful and participants expressed the need for training to be "practical" and less theoretical. Seventy-six percent of respondents felt the state training video tape was the least useful aspect of the session. The amount of material covered was reasonable to 86% of the respondents and members would like earlier notification of meeting times. Finally, respondents would like more information about curricula materials (basic course outlines), a list of problems to avoid, information on funding sources, and information on change and leadership theory.
* On March 31, 1992 a survey was mailed to all Consortium members to determine initial support for Tech prep. A response rate of 65% revealed 67% of the respondents were "very supportive" of Tech Prep, 31% "somewhat supportive," and one individual, "tentative/cautious." In terms of school support for Tech Prep, 36% respondents felt their school was "very supportive" of Tech Prep, 43% were "somewhat supportive," and 21% (N=9), "tentative/cautious." Caution appeared related to failures of past educational initiatives, funding concerns, and current high demand on teachers. Positive expectations for Tech Prep include the opportunity for greater team work within and between

schools and local business/industry, new curriculum and ideas, and pooling resources. Negative expectations included funding and implementation concerns, inability for some teachers to change, time constraints, and need for technology. Forty percent of site team members were asked to participate on their school site team while 57% cited philosophical reasons for agreeing to be a member. Twenty-six percent of the respondents (N=11) feel their schools have limited knowledge about Tech Prep at this time, 29% believe their school reactions are positive, 31% are mixed, and 12% (N=5) feel overall school response to Tech Prep has been negative. A total of 60% of respondents believe the transition to Tech Prep will be smooth in their school, 33% do not expect an easy transition, and 7% did not respond. Four members (10%) do not expect to benefit personally from Tech Prep involvement while 88% believe they will gain from involvement. Generally, upgraded technology, benefits to students, and new curricula were cited as areas of potential gain for the schools. Eighty-eight percent of respondents anticipate positive long-term impacts from Tech Prep and 90% believe it will help general education students.

* On April 27, 1992, a third training session introducing technology and cooperative teaching occurred. The session was evaluated. Ninety-seven percent of respondents found the session helpful and to many, it was the curriculum information that was most helpful while for others, the interchange of ideas and practical information was useful. Least useful aspects were too few specifics and some repetition. Ninety-two percent of respondents felt the amount of material covered was reasonable. Members suggested agendas be mailed in advance, more curriculum materials from demonstration-site presenters, and one person needs to be included on the mailing list. Respondents would like more information about curriculum materials (45%) and 41% would like more information about Tech Prep, information on 4-MAT, lists of funding sources, training in learning styles and student evaluation. Sixty-five percent of responding participants offered praise or encouragement of Consortium efforts.
* On May 17, 1992 a questionnaire was mailed to every member of the school site teams to gather data regarding change in attitude toward Tech Prep involvement. An 80% response rate was obtained and the following results indicated there is variation among schools in terms of level of involvement, knowledge of the initiative, regularity of site-team meetings, some uncertainty about the Region newsletter, and tenure of Consortium involvement. A total of 88% of the respondents believe Region 10 Phase One has been successful while five members felt it was not very helpful as they were "still in the planning stage" or "not convinced that it will work." Eighty-eight percent of the respondents consider themselves "supportive" in their commitment to Tech Prep. Two members are "tentative/cautious" which they remained throughout Phase One; their attitude related to a philosophical disagreement for one and lack of trust that funding or business/industry involvement would occur for the other. Ninety-three percent of site team respondents feel their role on the team has been clearly defined and 93% of the team members wish to continue their involvement. Ways to improve Phase One were to get an earlier start and provide more time with planning sites. Other suggestions included more help at the local level, chance to meet with schools of similar size and funding, more example lesson plans, and advance notice of meetings. One respondent suggested that the entire school ought to be acquainted with Tech Prep. Respondents indicated Region 10 has met its goals to initially orient schools to Tech Prep, provide an understanding of the target students, and understanding of the Tech Prep rationale and general objectives. Goals difficult to access at this point were whether or not appropriate and beneficial training had been provided (several commented this question should be asked after the June training), if sites were helped to identify broad occupational areas for Tech Prep focus, and if identification of staff development needs and a design for programs to meet schools' needs had occurred.
* The June 12, 15, and 16 training sessions for teachers and administrators in Region 10 was evaluated with a survey on the final day, June 16. A total of 54 forms (approximately 90%) were returned. Ninety-two percent of the respondents rated the sessions "helpful" citing especially the networking and role clarification activities. The business/industry panel was the most useful aspect of the training for 76% of the respondents. Least useful were curriculum theory, applied learning, or writing competencies for 36% of respondents, 26% felt sessions were somewhat repetitious, and 26% didn't like the Ivy Tech, Vincennes or A.I.T. presentation. Members continue to suggest more specifics in

training sessions and more time to work as school teams. At this time, 97% of members rated themselves as supportive of Tech Prep and all site team members (100%) wish to continue as site team members or coordinators.

INTRODUCTION

"More than half of the high school students in America are in general and vocational programs. How well these students perform in high school, and later, will determine in good measure how well America performs in our increasingly competitive global economy. Most of these students may have the capacity to achieve more than is expected currently. In fact, students in general and vocational programs have demonstrated that they can master higher level mathematics, science, and language arts. Students are mastering these higher level competencies when they use them to perform real tasks and to solve real problems."

SREB-State Vocational Education
Consortium Executive Committee

How challenged are students enrolled in vocational/technical programs in American secondary schools? Is the educational system falling behind technologically so that high schools produce students who are ill-equipped and poorly prepared to enter today's work force? In 1987, in response to national legislation, the Indiana General Assembly passed Chapter 5.6 of Public Law 217 requiring the development of technology preparation curriculum models for secondary schools throughout the state. The law initially necessitated that technology curricula be available to all high school students by the year 1990-91; however, amendments have extended the time-frame to the 1994-95 academic year.

According to the Technology Preparation Task Force (1989), "the law requires that the curriculum be performance based; provide students with skills necessary for employment or further education; relate to a broad scope of occupational opportunities; include math, science and English/language arts taught through practical application; be designed to coordinate the secondary curriculum with the post-secondary curriculum; and allow for dual credit, advanced standing and cooperative agreements." Targeting students who are enrolled in "general" education courses eschewing either the traditional four year college preparation tract or preparation to enter immediately into work, Tech Prep legislation would provide alternatives for the less focused student.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) was given the major role in administering the Tech Prep legislation. In 1988, the IDOE solicited applications for grant monies from communities interested in developing the Tech Prep curriculum. By 1989, five prototypes were selected as pilot sites for funding. Later, school districts were invited to present regional Tech Prep plans for approval and funding. One response to the call for advancing high school participation in Tech Prep was a 1991 proposal from a Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium.

Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium

The Region 10 Consortium was formed to "further develop and expand the use of the Tech Prep model adopted by the State of Indiana to all institutions in the region." (Ricklin, 1991) On August 19, 1991, Bruce Ricklin (Tech Prep Project Manager for Region 10) sent a letter to Consortium members in his region requesting a meeting to review and critique an outline for a Tech Prep proposal. The grant proposal was submitted to the Indiana Department of Workforce Development on September 16, 1991. Grant participants included: Monroe County Community Schools, Richland-Bean Blossom Schools, Eastern School District, Mitchell Community Schools, Shakamak Schools, North Lawrence Schools, White River Valley Schools, Ivy Tech, Vincennes University, Indiana University and Indiana State University.

The Region 10 grant was organized into a three-year plan with the initial year designated as the planning stage, the second primarily for curriculum development, and the third as the implementation phase of the project. To be effective, the Consortium was designed to involve members of Region 10 secondary school faculty, administration, local business and industry representatives, and partners in post-secondary education programs accessible to the Region. Goals of the initial year were to include: "planning and establishing the process to create an effective regional effort. Planned outcomes within high schools were to foster articulation between Region 10 secondary and post-secondary schools, implementation of a competency-based curriculum, and use of effective learning and teaching strategies." (Ricklin, 1991)

With strong indications that the Region 10 Tech Prep proposal would receive funding, site coordinators were established and monthly meetings of the Tech Prep Region 10 Site Coordinators began in November of 1991. The initial meetings were held to discuss provisions of the grant proposal, organization on-site, and budgetary needs. In December, with grant approval imminent, the services of a formative evaluator for the Project were solicited. Final grant approval was received on January 17, 1992.

Tech Prep Evaluation

On January 24, 1992, the evaluation team first met with the Region 10 Project Coordinator, Bruce Ricklin, to discuss evaluation needs. The grant proposal called for the hiring of an independent evaluator who would "develop and utilize formative and summative evaluation instruments to assess the effectiveness of Tech Prep development and implementation in Region 10." The goals of the evaluation were to:

1) Monitor and inform Project administrators about how the program is working and at strategic points, what changes needed to be made to improve the program;

2) Provide a historical and chronological record of the developments in Phase One;

3) Design interview protocols and surveys to assess how well the Consortium met its established goals for the initial (Phase One) year; and

4) Establish a baseline of entry-level data from project participants from which to longitudinally measure effectiveness of the Consortium efforts.

In June of 1992, the Region 10 Consortium completed the first year (Phase One) of the grant. Thirteen high schools were involved in the initial planning year and the Consortium has begun to set goals for the 1992-93 curriculum development phase (Phase Two). The original timeline and objectives for phase one had to be adjusted as grant approval came three months after the planned starting time as defined in the grant proposal. The timeline of Consortium activities is presented in Appendix A. Student data from participating high schools, self-report from surveys, interviews, observations, and historical documentation provide the data that is analyzed and discussed in the following evaluation report, which is organized chronologically by topics. Data sources used to determine how well Phase One of the Consortium was implemented and a profile of each of the participating schools is included. A summary and recommendations are also presented.

PART I
Planning Phase - Organizational Structure

The Region 10 Consortium called for a partnership among secondary schools, post-secondary schools, and business and industry. Member high schools were to work collaboratively to develop Tech Prep phase-in for the Region. Essential to the success of the planning phase was the exchange of information and good communication between participating schools and members of the Consortium. To accomplish the goal of collaboration, the grant proposal required regular meetings of different key committees among the high schools and different stake holders in the Consortium. An organizational chart, presented in Table 1 below, reveals the organizational structure of collaboration. The roles of each committee are discussed by section.

TABLE 1
Region 10 Organizational Chart

Region 10 Consortium: Director, Bruce Ricklin		Site Teams: 13 High School Teams; Coordinators
Regional Staff Development Committee	Coordinating Council: Post-Secondary Admin.; High School Admin; Chamber of Commerce Education Coordinator; Chair Business/Industry Council; Chair each Regional Committee; Bruce Ricklin (Director Region 10 Consortium).	Regional Curriculum Committee - Post-Secondary and High School
	Business/Industry Council	

Coordinating Council

The grant proposal called for the convening of Coordinating Council meetings in November, January, March, and May. The role of the committee would be to "oversee operations of the Region 10 Consortium and to develop procedures for implementation of Consortium goals." (Ricklin, 1991) A review of Region 10 files indicated the Council met on November 25, 1991, February 26, 1992, and on May 12, 1992. Observation of the February and May meetings revealed this committee provided much of the strategic planning and guidance for the region. Bruce Ricklin developed the agenda and facilitated all meetings.

Regional Curriculum Committee, Business/Industry Council, and Regional Staff Development Council

The Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium did not receive actual funding until January of 1992 although the grant was written with a timeline of activities to begin in November, 1991. Due to the reduced amount of time available for Phase One, some of the goals for the first year were moved to 1992-93, Phase Two. The Regional Curriculum Committee will begin meetings during 1992-93 as its membership naturally evolves out of the site teams. The Regional Staff Development Committee meetings were collapsed into the Coordinating Council meetings as the Tech Prep Director believed it would not be wise to overtax Consortium members with other committee obligations, especially due to the shortened

time frame for planning and development activities. As part of the Coordinating Council, development activities could be on-going with an already active committee.

The proposal called for the establishment of a "Business/Industry Advisory Council which would provide information and assistance to the developing Tech Prep project." (Ricklin, 1991) Currently, Partners in Education (PIE), a group affiliated with the Monroe County Chamber of Commerce has been serving as the business representative for the Tech Prep Consortium. Bruce Ricklin meets monthly with PIE to update members on Region 10 Tech Prep progress. During the 1992-93 academic year, Bruce intends to ask secondary schools to recommend local business and industry representatives who will offer regional representation to the Consortium. At that time, the Advisory Council will meet independently of PIE.

Site Teams

Initially, Eastern, Mitchell, Bloomington North, Bloomington South, Bedford North Lawrence, North Lawrence Area Vocational Center, Edgewood, Spencer-Owen, White River Valley, Shakamak, and Martinsville High Schools agreed to consortium membership. On January 7, 1992, Bruce Ricklin sent a letter to all participating high schools requesting that the schools begin to identify their high school team. The site team would ideally consist of a science, math, English, and vocational/technical teacher as well as a counselor and administrative member. Site team lists were mailed back to the Tech Prep office and listed high school faculty were added to the Region 10 mailing list. By late March of 1992, Linton-Stockton and Bloomfield High Schools began to work with the Consortium expanding Region 10 membership to all high schools in the Region. Beginning in December of 1991, and by the end of March, Bruce had completed an orientation meeting at each of the secondary schools in the Consortium and had also visited some of the participating post-secondary institutions.

As indicated in the proposal, on-going monthly meetings of school site teams were to begin in November, 1991. Review of school documentation reveals that Bloomington North and South High Schools, Edgewood, and White River Valley began meetings in November of 1991 while the schools that entered the Consortium later (Bloomfield, Owen Valley, and Linton) began school site team meetings in the spring of 1992. Bloomington North and South had site teams already established due to their earlier involvement in Tech Prep as demonstration sites; however, new teachers were being oriented to the program and began to attend meetings.

Participating Consortium High Schools

A school-by-school profile presents school data, based on figures from school administration or counseling staff, for each of the participating secondary institutions in the Region 10 Consortium. Data for Bedford North Lawrence High School and North Lawrence Area Vocational-Technical School are presented together just as Bloomington High School North and Hoosier Hills Area Vocational School are presented together.

Bedford North Lawrence High School and North Lawrence Area Vocational/Technical School

The Bedford North High School is located in Bedford, Indiana. The major employers of the region are a GM Power Train Division, Ford Electronics Plant, Stone City Products, and Naval Weapons Systems in Crane, Indiana. Approximately 1,697 students are enrolled in the high school. The senior class averages around 375 students and generally 50% will enroll in some post-secondary training. Institutions the majority of these students attend are Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State University, Vincennes University, IUPUI, Ball State University, ITT Tech, and Louisville Tech.

Fifty-five percent of the student body is enrolled in general education courses. A total of 23% of students attending ninth through twelfth grade drop out of high school before receiving a diploma and approximately 221 students enroll in the vocational/technical courses.

Bloomfield High School

Bloomfield High School is located in Bloomfield, Indiana. Approximately 70% of Bloomfield residents are blue-collar workers and the main employers in the area are Jack Factory, KPT Tile Factory, Comarco, and the Naval Weapons Systems center in Crane, Indiana. About 370 students are enrolled in the school and approximately 95% graduate yearly. Eighty-eight percent of graduates attend post-secondary training with the majority (about 56%) attending a four-year college, 19% a two-year college, 13% a technical school, and about 1% joining the military.

About 55% of the student body is enrolled in general education courses with 30% in the vocational/technical category. An estimated 5% of students grade nine through twelve drop-out of high school before earning a diploma.

Bloomington High School North and Hoosier Hills Area Voc School

One of the original five pilot-schools (1989-90), Bloomington High School North is one of two secondary schools in Bloomington, Indiana. Approximately 1,250 students are enrolled in ninth through twelfth grades. Each year approximately 86% of the students graduate from the school and generally, about 65% go on to attend a post-secondary institution. Frequently attended institutions include Purdue University, Indiana University, Indiana State University, and Vincennes. Approximately three out of every four students take courses to prepare for some form of post-secondary training.

Sixty-percent of local workers are in what is commonly called white-collar working positions with 40% in blue-collar jobs. Major employers in the area include: Thompson Electronics, Indiana University, and various stone quarries.

Bloomington High School South

Bloomington High School South was also a pilot-site for the 1989-90 Tech Prep implementation. Enrolling approximately 1,550 students, 80% generally graduate and approximately 80% enroll in some post-secondary schooling (an estimated 50% of these students will drop-out of post-secondary school). Indiana University and Purdue University enroll the majority of students with students attending other state and out-of-state schools as well as Ivy Tech. Forty percent of Bloomington South students are enrolled in general education courses and about 20-30 students participate in Tech Prep. Approximately 15-20% of ninth through twelfth graders drop out before completing high school.

The ratio of blue-collar to white-collar positions in the Bloomington community is about 60 to 40 with more white collar workers than blue. Due to the large university population, service positions in retail and restaurants is part of the local employment profile.

Eastern District Jr-Sr High School

Eastern High School is located in Bloomfield, Indiana and enrolls approximately 520 students in grades seven through 12. About 85% of the students graduate each year and 55-60% will enroll in some form of post-secondary training. Institutions that students attend include Indiana University, Purdue University, Ball State, Ivy Tech, Indiana State University, and Vincennes. Approximately 70% of those who attend a two-year institution will graduate while 60% who attend a four-year degree granting institution will receive a degree.

The major employers in the area are Indiana University, Crane Naval Weapons, and the Eastern School Corporation. Eighty percent of workers are in blue-collar positions while 20% are in positions that are generally categorized as white-collar. Thirty percent of the student body are enrolled in general education courses.

Edgewood High School

Located in Ellettsville, Indiana, Edgewood High School has about 750 students enrolled with a graduation rate of approximately 93-95%. Of this total, about 60% go on to post-secondary training and attend Indiana University, Purdue, Vincennes, IUPUI, Ball State, University of Southern Indiana, Ivy Tech and other nationwide schools. About 15% drop out of post-secondary training before receiving a degree. Thirty percent of students at the high school are enrolled in general education courses and about 25% are in vocational/technical courses.

Sixty-five percent of local workers are in white-collar positions while 35% are blue-collar workers. The major employers in the area are Indiana University, Bloomington Hospital, General Electric, and Thompson Consumer Electronics.

Linton-Stockton High School

Approximately 425 students are enrolled in Linton-Stockton High School and 92% generally graduate from high school. Thirty-eight percent of students attend some post-secondary training and about 10% drop-out before completing a degree. Institutions which Linton students attend include Indiana State University, Vincennes University, and Ivy Tech. Fourteen percent of the students graduate from a two-year institution while approximately 24% will graduate from a four-year school. Sixty-two percent of Linton students are enrolled in general education courses.

The main employers in the area are Crane Naval Weapons, coal mines, and General Electric. Approximately 80% of jobs in the area are considered blue-collar while 20% are white-collar positions.

Martinsville High School

Approximately 1,600 students are enrolled at Martinsville High School located in Martinsville, Indiana. Currently, about 97% of the students graduate from the school and 75% of all students are enrolled in some general education courses. Forty-five percent of students go on to attend some post-secondary training and most attend in-state schools. The major employer of the area is Harmon Motive while some residents commute to Indianapolis or Bloomington, Indiana.

Mitchell High School

Mitchell high school is located in Mitchell, Indiana. The school enrolls approximately 615 students and 75% graduate each year. About 35% of the students will attend some form of post-secondary education predominately entering in-state schools such as Indiana University, Ivy Tech, Vincennes, and Indiana State University.

Major employers in the Mitchell area include Carpenters, United Technology, Essex, Central Foundry, and Leigh Cement. Eighty-five percent of workers are blue-collar and 56% of students enroll in general education courses.

Owen Valley Community High School

Owen Valley enrolls approximately 865 students and 81% graduate each year. Forty percent of graduates go on to attend some form of post-secondary education with Indiana University, Indiana State University, Purdue, Vincennes, and Ivy Tech the predominant schools. Fifty-one percent of the student body enroll in general education courses.

Owen Valley High School is located in Spencer, Indiana a small community with Wal Mart, the school system, Cook Urological, and Boston Scientific the major employers of the area.

Shakamak High School

Located in Jasonville, Indiana, Shakamak enrolls approximately 330 students. Each year about 84% graduate from high school and 45% attend some form of post-secondary training. Thirty percent attend a four-year institution, about 10% attend Vincennes University or another two-year institution, and about 10% enroll at Ivy Tech. One quarter of the student population enroli in general education courses while at Shakamak.

The community is small and approximately 60% of all local workers are employed in a blue-collar position. The major employers are two small local factories, the school district, a nursing home and local health services, and coal mines.

White River Valley High School

Located in Switz City, a rural community, White River Valley High School enrolls approximately 300 students, 90% of whom graduate from high school. Generally about 83% go on to some form of post-secondary training with Indiana University, Vincennes, and Indiana State University some of the schools most frequently attended.

Sixty percent of the students enroll in some general education courses in the high school. Major employers in the area include Crane Naval Weapons, the school system, and service related occupations. Workers are predominantly in blue-collar positions.

Composite of Consortium Secondary Schools

Enrollment data indicates that participating Region 10 schools fall into three categories: those with small enrollments of 450 or less students (Bloomfield, Linton-Stockton, White River Valley, Shakamak); schools with enrollments of between 451 to 1,000 students (Eastern, Edgewood, Mitchell, Owen Valley); and schools with over 1,001 students (Bedford North Lawrence, Bloomington North, Bloomington South, Martinsville). A school composite is presented in Table 2 on the following page.

TABLE 2
Enrollment Data for Region 10 Consortium Schools

SCHOOL	Approximate # Enrolled	% That Graduate	% That Attend A Post-Secondary School	% In General Education Courses
Bedford North Lawrence and North Lawrence Voc/Tech	1,697	77%	50%	55%
Bloomfield	370	95%	88%	55%
Bloomington North	1,250	86%	65%	25%
Bloomington South	1,550	80%	80%	40%
Eastern	520	85%	57%	30%
Edgewood	750	94%	60%	30%
Linton-Stockton	425	92%	38%	62%
Martinsville	1,600	97%	45%	75%
Mitchell	615	75%	35%	56%
Owen Valley	865	81%	40%	51%
Shakamak	330	84%	45%	25%
White River Valley	300	90%	83%	60%

PART II
DATA COLLECTION AND RESULTS

The goals of the Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium were delineated in the proposal and included participation in state-sponsored training, the development of strategies for training, and dissemination of a regional Tech Prep newsletter. More specifically, these activities would lead to the following:

1) Build ownership and investment on the part of Consortium members;

2) Provide orientation and training of site teams and personnel;

3) Develop a coordination network with the state training component and the demonstration sites;

4) Identify staff development needs and design staff development programs; and

5) Develop plans to include secondary schools from Region 10 who did not participate in the original Consortium.

In order to assess whether the Consortium was meeting its established goals and the deadlines prescribed for goal-related activities, the following data gathering methodologies were used by the formative evaluators: observation of Region 10 meetings by a member of the evaluation team; development of a survey to gather formative data regarding constituency response to planning and training sessions; design of a pre- and post-survey to gather entry-level or baseline data regarding Consortium membership; and review of Region 10 records. Results from evaluation strategies follow in chronological order.

September 9, 1991

On September 9, Bruce Ricklin mailed a letter to potential Consortium members which included certain areas of the grant proposal for comment before the final draft was mailed to the state.

November 25, 1991

The Coordinating Council met on November 25 and at that time, secondary school representatives were encouraged to begin thinking about individuals in the school who would be appropriate as site team members.

December, 1991

Bruce Ricklin began to visit each site to conduct an orientation to Tech Prep. Bruce also visited some of the post-secondary institutions.

January 17, 1992

Final grant approval was received for Region 10 funding.

February 26, 1992 - Meeting of the Coordinating Council

On February 26, the Coordinating Council met to review the region 10 planning schedule. As grant approval came over two months after planning activities were to begin, the Council decided to move

some of the 1991-92 planning objectives to Phase Two (1992-93). At this meeting, the evaluation team was introduced to coordinators.

March 11, 1992 - State Planned Tech Prep Training Session

The first state run training session took place on March 11, 1992. All Consortium members were mailed a letter in advance informing them of the session. Titled "Administrative Planning," the session included a viewing of the state developed and produced training video tape as well as a discussion, facilitated by Bruce Ricklin, to clarify the importance of Tech Prep in the state, clarify secondary administrators role, and to identify specific concerns and problems in the Consortium schools. In attendance were secondary administrators or faculty from 10 of the Consortium secondary schools. One issue that was discussed by two site team members had to do with implementation of Tech Prep at small high schools with less than 500 students noting that demonstration sites were all much larger. A participant observed that North Montgomery might provide the closest model for smaller secondary schools. Meeting participants developed a list of key issues for Tech Prep.

March 24, 1992 - State Planned Tech Prep Training Session

On March 24, 1992 the second state planned training session, "Organizing a Local Team and Business/Industry Partnerships," occurred. The session began with a viewing of the state produced video tape that lasted about one-hour and moved to a team-building activity and general discussion about the exercise and video. In attendance were approximately 30 site team members and school administrators from the Consortium along with a formative evaluator and the facilitator, Bruce Ricklin. An evaluation of the session follows.

The response rate for the *Session Evaluation* form was 70% (21 forms were returned). Respondents represented nine of the 13 Consortium schools with two forms from Edgewood; three from Bloomington High School South; two from Bloomington North; two from Martinsville, North Lawrence Voc-Tech Center returned four; Mitchell responded with two; three were returned from Owen Valley; two from Bedford North Lawrence; and one from Eastern. Results from the survey were developed into a detailed report providing formative information to the Tech Prep Regional 10 Director to assist in planning for Consortium training and constituency needs. Findings revealed the following:

* Sixteen (76%) of the 21 respondents reported the training session was helpful, four (19%) felt it was not helpful, and one (4%) reported it was "somewhat helpful." Comments indicated the opportunity to work together, learn from one another, and team build was beneficial. Members expressed a need for the sessions to be "practical" (less theoretical) and to provide new information.
* The most useful aspects of the session were: the team activity (selected by 38%), 28% mentioned the opportunity to share with one another, and 28% cited some aspect of the information conveyed in the tape, handouts, or discussion.
* The least useful aspects of the training session for 16 (76%) respondents was the video while an additional two (10%) cited the "egg-protector exercise."
* When asked about the amount of material covered in the session, 18 (86%) reported it was reasonable while three (14%) felt it was too little.
* Members were asked what material might they have received prior to the meeting. Five (24%) respondents commented that they would have liked to receive the handouts prior to the session.
* Areas from which members would like to receive more information included: curricula materials, i.e. basic course outlines and sequencing; information from counselors; a list of problems to avoid; sources of funding; information on change and leadership theory; and more advance notice of meetings.

* Finally, team members were asked how the meetings could better meet their needs. Eight of the 15 respondents (53%) commented on the role of interaction with other teachers and the sharing of information from current pilot site personnel; two respondents (13%) offered logistical suggestions; and five (33%) respondents gave individual suggestions. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix B.

Specific recommendations to the Tech Prep Region 10 Director, Bruce Ricklin, included use of name tags to help new members learn others in the group; seating site teams by school and providing a school tag; and use of more "practical and less theoretical" information. Members from small schools emphasized the need to learn how the Tech Prep model can be implemented in smaller schools. Sharing time, networking, and mentoring between the schools was seen as a benefit of Consortium involvement that should be continued.

March 31, 1992 - *Initial Site Team Questionnaire*

On March 31, 1992, an *Initial Site Team Questionnaire* was mailed to the 65 members of the secondary school site teams. Forty-two surveys were returned for a response rate of 65%. Returns by school were: Bedford North Lawrence/North Lawrence Voc-Tech Center (8), Bloomington North (5), Bloomington South (7), Eastern (2), Edgewood (3), Martinsville (4), Mitchell (3), Owen Valley (3), Shakamak (2), and White River Valley (5). Bloomfield and Linton-Stockton were not surveyed having not yet entered the Consortium. A copy of the survey is included as Appendix C. Results of the survey included the following data:

* Site team members were asked to describe their commitment to Tech Prep. Twenty-eight (67%) of the 42 respondents reported they are "very supportive," 13 (31%) feel "somewhat supportive," and one (2%) described their commitment as "tentative/cautious."
* Greater caution was apparent when site members were asked to describe their school's commitment to Tech Prep. Fifteen (36%) reported their school was "very supportive," 18 (43%) are "somewhat supportive," and nine (21%) are "tentative/cautious." Comments indicated caution was related to failures of past educational initiatives, need for money, and the current high demands upon teaching staff.
* Members were asked to list their positive and negative expectations for Tech Prep. Positive comments included: opportunity for greater team work within the school and between the school and local business/industry; staff development, new curriculum, and new ideas; and pooling resources. Negative expectations included: night meetings; funding; implementation concerns; inability for some teachers to change; time; and need for more technology.
* Site team members were asked to discuss why they became involved with the Consortium. Seventeen (40%) of the respondents were asked to participate, 24 (57%) cited philosophical reasons for their involvement (which was in keeping with that of Tech Prep), and one (2%) did not respond to the question. Comments indicated respondents were generally supportive and interested in Tech Prep.
* Team members were asked about the teacher, administrator, and student response to the program in their individual school. Eleven (26%) report their school has limited knowledge or exposure at this time so response is generally unknown. One (2%) person did not respond to this item, 12 (29%) believe reactions are positive, 13 (31%) see mixed responses (both positive and negative), and five (12%) feel overall responses have been negative.
* Site members were asked to predict if the transition to incorporate Tech Prep would be smooth. Fourteen (33%) do not expect a smooth transition, three (7%) did not respond to this item, and 25 (60%) either believe it will be smooth or will eventually benefit the school. Reasons why the initiative might not go smoothly included: resistance from teaching staff to change and need for money to support the initiative.

* Changes needed in the schools to adopt Tech Prep included: curriculum changes, new or upgraded technology, scheduling modifications, changing attitudes, and forging connections with business and industry. Seven respondents still need more information about Tech Prep.
* Four (10%) felt they will not personally benefit as a result of Tech Prep involvement, one (2%) did not respond, and 37 (88%) believe they will gain in some way from their involvement. Only one person, who does not feel they will benefit, made a comment and the remarks indicated the individual expects to have added work or responsibilities. Generally, members cited benefits to students and upgraded technology and curriculum areas in which they expect to benefit.
* A majority of respondents (88%) anticipate positive long-term impacts from Tech Prep which include: better training for students, new materials and ideas for teachers, and upgraded technology.
* Major problems for Tech Prep implementation were grouped into the following categories: money (43% cited this as a problem), getting teachers involved (7%), changing teacher attitudes (12%), time (10%), and need for better/more technology (36%). Five respondents do not foresee any problems while one person expects difficulties in "almost every facet."
* A final question asked if Tech Prep would benefit general education students. Three (7%) respondents did not answer the question, one (2%) reported it would not benefit, and 38 (90%) believe it will help general education students.

Data from the *Initial Site Team Questionnaire* indicates that schools in the Region 10 Consortium are at different levels of introduction/implementation to Tech Prep. Eleven (26%) site team members commented that the teachers, students and administrators in their schools have limited knowledge about the initiative. Due to the differences that exist between the schools, the recommendation was made that future training might include division into groups by need or interest, use of experienced members to train others (older site team members could mentor with new members), or a choice of several training sessions. Members identified topics about which they would like more information. Areas of interest included possible funding sources; curriculum materials; establishing relationships with business and industry; and information about collaborative learning, team teaching, and applied curriculum.

April 27, 1992 - Tech Prep Training Session

The third state planned meeting covered the topics "Introduction to Technology and Subject Matter Interaction/Cooperative Teaching." The Region 10 Consortium chose to develop its own training (in response to Consortium member encouragement) and scheduled speakers from four of the Tech Prep demonstration sites who presented their ideas, shared curriculum, and answered Tech Prep questions specific to Consortium members. Approximately 55 individuals who were either members of a site team, school administrators, or representatives from a post-secondary institution were in attendance at the meeting. Initially, visitors from the demonstration sites addressed the entire group and later asked that participants break into content areas for more specific information sharing. Members were grouped by content areas: technology, business, counselors, mathematics, science, and English-language arts. Discussion in the small groups ranged from individual sharing about the current status of course work, barriers, to grant writing and funding, actual applications based lesson planning, concern for how to implement the program in small schools with limited staff and resources, how to advertise and promote Tech Prep in the schools, and course competencies.

A *Session Evaluation* was administered to attending site members and 49 questionnaires were collected from participants at the end of the session. The following data resulted:

* Participants were asked to decide if the session was helpful. Forty-six (94%) of the respondents reported "yes" it was helpful and three (3%) reported it was helpful but qualified their answers with comments that indicated that for one individual the information was repetitive and for another it was too much information. Thirty-three participants commented about why the session was helpful. A majority of those that commented (36%) cited curriculum information from practicing teachers as most

helpful, 21% mentioned the interchange of ideas with other teachers, 18% felt they received practical information, and 15% commented that it was useful.

* When asked which aspects of the session were most useful, 47 participants responded with 22 (47%) citing the sharing/exchange of ideas, eight (17%) mentioned the group discussion, seven (15%) appreciated the materials and handouts, four (8%) identified specific speakers as most useful, and six (11%) commented about the food, emphasis on the community, recruitment practices, and new information.
* The least useful aspects of the session included too many small groups meeting in one room; seeing how many potential problems the pilot sites did not face; one speaker dominating the meeting in one small group; need for more specifics; topic discussions were too specific for an administrator; time limits; and some of the information was repetitive of the site visits.
* Participants were asked to rate the amount of material covered in the session. Three (6%) reported it was too much, 45 (92%) felt it was reasonable, and one (2%) believed it was too little.
* When asked about what information could have been given to participants before the training, five (25%) indicated an agenda or list of participants would have been helpful, 30% would have liked curriculum materials from the presenters, and 45% cited the following: general Tech Prep information, not sure, and one needed to be on the mailing list.
* Additional areas about which participants would like to receive information include the following: 45% would like curriculum materials, 38% want continued meetings, 6% mentioned counseling concerns, 41% mentioned the following: historical information about Tech Prep, learning styles training, student evaluation, information on 4-MAT, information on funding, and more exposure to Tech Prep implementation.
* Thirty percent of the respondents believe training sessions could be improved by changes in the schedule or environment, while 65% of respondents offered praise and encouragement, and one post-secondary faculty member noted the information was not very applicable at this stage.

May 4, 1992 - Evaluation Meeting with Tech Prep Region 10 Director

On May 4, 1992 a meeting between the formative evaluators and Bruce Ricklin occurred at the Tech Prep Region 10 office. The meeting provided an opportunity to view the files and communications related to the Project. Bruce expressed satisfaction with school site team involvement and that all Region 10 secondary schools had become active with the Consortium. Although not proceeding on schedule (due to the lag time between actual receipt of funding for the proposal and initial timeline), the Consortium had completed several important activities for the year. Bruce had extended his involvement in the state-wide Tech Prep effort by becoming a member of the Tech Prep Staff Training Steering Committee as the representative for Region 10, 11, and 12. Bruce was involved in planning the June training sessions for Region 10.

May 12, 1992 - Meeting of the Coordinating Council

At the May 12 meeting of the Coordinating Council, Bruce Ricklin discussed the status of the Region 10 budget and training needs for Consortium members. Meeting participants included administrators from Consortium secondary schools, Vincennes, Ivy Tech, and formative evaluators. A timeline for training and a one-day planning session was established. The need to know training dates was expressed by several site team coordinators as the end of the school year rapidly approaches. The role of the post-secondary schools continues to be that of interested observers. Consortium needs at this time are as follows: need to establish training dates, further discussion on how to set-up articulation agreements, how to start forming the business/industry committee, and (for smaller schools) amount of freedom to integrate Tech Prep into existing curriculum instead of having a separate track.

May 17, 1992 - *Site Team Questionnaire*

Initially, a pre- and post-survey strategy was planned to gather data regarding change in attitude towards involvement in the Consortium over time. The *Initial Survey* was administered on March 31, 1992 and due to the short interval between March and May, a post-survey was not used. Two questions on both the *Initial* and *Site Team Questionnaire* were identical, the others were designed to gather data regarding how well the Region 10 Consortium had met its goals for Phase One. Findings from the *Site Team Questionnaire* are discussed below.

A total of 82 questionnaires were mailed to site team members in all Region 10 Tech Prep secondary schools on May 17, 1992. Sixty-six surveys were returned for a response rate of 80%. A copy of the survey is presented as Appendix D.

* When asked to record the date of Tech Prep involvement, dates ranged from August of 1991 for a site team coordinator to May, 1992 for a site team member. Dates of involvement confirmed an observation that site team membership had changed in some schools.
* Team members were asked to list all demonstration sites they had visited. Forty-five percent of site team coordinators had not visited a demonstration site while 55% had visited at least one site. None of the site team members from one high school had visited a site.
* In order to assess how actively involved each school site had become with the program, members were asked to report how frequently their teams were meeting. Responses revealed some uncertainty on the part of individual members. The greatest consistency of responses was exhibited by team members at Hoosier Hills Vocational School (monthly), Bloomington High School North (monthly), Bloomington High School South (weekly), and White River Valley (approximately monthly). It was not surprising that demonstration schools exhibited a more definite schedule. Five schools meet on an informal, as needed basis, while one school is not meeting but members will attend the Regional training. The additional schools were difficult to track as responses varied among members.
* Members were asked if they had received copies of the *Tech Prep Region 10 Newsletter*. Thirty-six percent of members reported they have not received a copy of the newsletter while all other respondents have received at least one.
* When asked to rate the first phase of Tech Prep involvement, 88% of responding site team members rated Region 10 as successful/helpful (this included 100% of responding site team coordinators) while three (5%) did not respond, and five felt it was not very successful/helpful. Comments from team members who rated success of Tech Prep negatively commented: "still in plan stage" and "I'm not convinced it will work." Positive responses included: "it's a start," "still in planning stage," and "Very helpful for myself - as a school, we do not yet have a strong commitment, many see it as a phase into another theme."
* Site team members were asked to describe their commitment to Tech Prep and 46 (70%) of all respondents reported they are "very supportive" (this included 73% of site team coordinators), 18 (27%) are "somewhat supportive," and two members (both from the same school) were "tentative/cautious." This same question was included on the *Initial Site Team Questionnaire* administered March 31, 1992. Results from the two were compared by matching returns for those who had completed both surveys and the total was 39. Comparisons revealed that seven (18%) went from "somewhat" to "very" supportive while four (10%) went from "very" to "somewhat" supportive and 28 (72%) remained the same. The two "tentative/cautious" members have remained the same throughout Phase One. The Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-ranks test can be used to compare change from a pre to a post-test. The statistical test was used to see if site team members' attitudes had changed significantly from the initial to the final survey. Results of the statistical test revealed there was no significant change in attitude, regarding commitment to Tech Prep, during the 47 day period.
* When asked if their role/responsibilities as a site team member had been clearly defined, 93% of site team members felt it had been clearly defined while four percent felt it had not. Two percent were

uncertain. Eighty-two percent of the site coordinators felt their role had been clearly defined and 18% were either uncertain or developing their role as they proceeded.

* Members were asked if they wished to continue as members of the site team. A total 93% of team members wish to continue while four percent do not. Of site coordinators, 91% wish to continue while 9%, one does not. Site members and coordinators who wished to discontinue involvement all commented that this was due to too many other school responsibilities or the inability to devote the time necessary to the team to do a good job.
* When asked what could have been done to make Phase One more successful, the majority of responses indicated a need for an earlier start and having more time with planning sites. Other suggestions were to have more help at the local level, meet with schools similar in size and funding,; to have more specific examples of lesson plans; set training dates in advance and give more advanced notice; and to involve school administrators in a more visible way. Coordinators also would like more administrative involvement at the schools, an earlier start, a paid part-time coordinator at each site, and time for regional directors to deal only with Tech Prep. It was also suggested that the entire school ought to be acquainted with Tech Prep.

Members were asked to rate a series of Region 10 Consortium goals in terms of how well they were met during the first year planning phase using a continuum from one (very well met) to five (not at all met). Response totals are listed in Table 3. Categories were collapsed from the five point Likert scale to three categories (goals met (1-2), goals not met (4-5), uncertain (3)) for greater ease in examining the results.

TABLE 3
Ratings by Site Team Members to Region 10 Goals - How Well Were They Met?

GOALS	GOALS MET N	%	UNCERTAIN N	%	GOALS NOT MET N	%
Building Ownership - felt a sense of belonging to the Tech Prep "team"	41	62%	17	26%	7	11%
the extent to which your concerns and needs addressed by the Consortium	34	52%	28	42%	3	5%
Orientation - received orientation by Region 10 Administration to Tech Prep	51	77%	6	9%	8	12%
received initial understanding of students Tech Prep is targeting, program rationale, and its general objectives	55	83%	9	14%	1	2%
Training - received appropriate and beneficial training	31	47%	17	26%	15	23%
received help to begin to develop course competencies for your school	26	39%	19	29%	17	26%
Identify - the broad occupational areas that will be the focus of Tech Prep in the school	31	47%	19	29%	14	21%
identified needs and designed staff development programs for schools	26	39%	19	29%	18	27%

Sixty-two percent of site team members felt the goal of building team ownership had been met while 11% felt it had not. Ten of the eleven site team coordinators who returned a survey felt this objective had been well met. Site team members who reported the goal had not been well met made comments that indicated there may be some problems with commitment at the high school level. The following comments were made: "no site team meetings," "unable to participate in meetings because of other school conflicts," "basically, I was told by my school to do it," and "I have not attended meetings."

Fifty-two percent of team members feel their concerns and needs have been addressed by the Consortium while 42% are uncertain. Only three (5%) respondents feel their needs have not been met and the following comments were made: "Our local and financial limitations cause concerns which are only briefly acknowledged but never really dealt with" and "no one in my content area at the sites."

The goal of conducting orientation to the Tech Prep philosophy was considered met by 77% of respondents. Eight site team members reported the goal had not been met and their comments indicated their response correlated with later involvement with the school team: "joined team too late," "missed out on first meeting," " I attended an orientation meeting but I did not feel it did an effective job of making me totally aware of the philosophy," "we were a little late at being included" and "I was appointed late to the committee and missed the orientation." In terms of understanding the target population for Tech Prep, 82% of team members felt this goal was well met. Two site team members reported the goal was not well met and responses indicated, it was due to late involvement. Uncertainty appeared related to general uncertainty about how the program will operate in the individual schools.

The Consortium intended to develop training that would meet the needs of Consortium members. At the time the survey was mailed, the regional training sessions had not yet occurred; however, the state training took place in March and April. Comments revealed that it was still too early for team members to rate this goal, although 45% thought it had been met, 26% were uncertain, and 24% believed it was not met. Help to begin to develop course competencies was another Region 10 goal that had not yet been addressed in committee or training and 27% of respondents noted this had not been met (as one commented "to be done this summer") while 38% believed it had. A few members who felt this goal had been met noted that their schools had received a set of the curriculum disks that were distributed at the April 27 training session.

Finally, goals of the Consortium included help identifying broad occupational areas for the school and help identifying staff development programs. Comments again indicate these goals could better be assessed after summer training.

June 12, 1992 - Region 10 Training for Teachers and Administrators

The first regional training session took place on June 12, 1992. Topics for the day included learning styles and collaborative learning. Approximately 65 members of site teams, two Ivy Tech faculty, and a formative evaluator were in attendance. The morning session included an orientation to and definition of learning styles and their value in the classroom. The afternoon session offered opportunities for participants to work collaboratively while learning the philosophy behind cooperative learning strategies. The session was not evaluated; however, a *Session Evaluation* form was prepared for administration the final day of training.

June 15, 1992 - Region 10 Training for Teachers and Administrators

The second day of regional training addressed the topics of "Applications Based Instruction and Subject Matter Integration." Again, approximately 65 members of the Consortium were in attendance and some attenders from individual sites had changed. Changes were primarily due to vacation

schedules and other schedule type conflicts. Handouts and materials were provided to attenders and the session ran from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

June 16, 1992 - Region 10 Training for Teachers and Administrators

The final day of regional training covered "Performance Based Curriculum and Business and Industry Involvement." A panel of business and industry representatives addressed specific concerns and potential for their support. The discussion was lively and at one point, a concern for funding was expressed by one site team member. A *Session Evaluation* form was administered to all members in attendance. A total of 54 forms were returned. Responses highlighted the following:

* Forty-nine (92%) respondents rated the sessions as helpful. Their comments most frequently cited issues of role clarification. Next in frequency, 27% cited the value of networking/teaming, one respondent rated the sessions "not as helpful as I had hoped," one felt they were "somewhat helpful" and two had mixed responses citing some redundancy.
* When asked about the most useful aspects of the three-day training, a majority (76%) rated the business/industry panel as one of the most useful presentations, 22% cited the learning styles presentation, and 13% liked the session on cooperative learning.
* In terms of least useful aspects, 47 responses were given and 17 (36%) cited curriculum theory, applied learning, or writing competencies as least useful, 12 (26%) cited the repetition of materials or presentations; seven (15%) believed the presentation by Ivy Tech or Vincennes was not useful; five (11%) cited the A.I.T. presentation; two (4%) did not like group activities, and two (4%) disapproved of the outburst by one site team member.
* When asked how training sessions could be improved, six (21%) of the 29 members who responded suggested a more detailed approach to the construction of an applied curriculum and another 21% wished to have more time to plan in their group/school. Members continue to ask for more specifics.
* When asked if role/responsibilities as a site team member were well defined, 54% said yes, 17% are uncertain, and 11% answered "no" expressing concern about the lack of involvement on the part of their principal. All others did not respond to this item.
* At this time, 78% of respondents rated themselves as "very supportive" of Tech Prep, 19% are "somewhat supportive," and two (4%) are "tentative/cautious." This same question was on the *Initial Site Team Questionnaire* administered on March 31, 1992. Responses for all individuals that completed both the initial and the current evaluation form were compared to see if respondents had significantly changed their attitude toward Tech Prep. There were a total of 38 matched pairs; 30 (79%) gave the same response on both forms, six (16%) improved from "somewhat" supportive to "very" supportive, and two were less supportive (one "very" to "somewhat" and one "very" to "tentative"). Using the Wilcoxon signed rank statistical test, there was no significant difference from the initial to the final survey.
* All 54 (100%) respondents wish to continue as a member of their school site team. This same question was asked on the *Initial Site Team Questionnaire* and at that time, one of the respondents was uncertain. That person has changed attitude and now wishes to continue.
* Final comments from Region 10 members indicated further information is needed for five members, nine offered suggestions, and five offered thanks/congratulations on Phase One efforts.

June 26, 1992 - Regional Planning Day

This was the final meeting for Region 10 during Phase One. Attenders were grouped by school and as a group, worked on developing their mission statement, identifying the supports and problems within their schools and noted what variables they have control of and those they do not. The school groups also worked on their individual school plan. Members from all but two groups commented at some time during the day that the session was very beneficial for them and their high school. With approximately

70 site team members present, and all schools represented, the planning day utilized many of the Tech Prep strategies and ideas, i.e., the session was applications based using collaborative efforts to build a consensus of ideas.

PART III
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusion of Phase one, the planning and development stage of Tech Prep implementation, in the region 10 Consortium occurred on June 30, 1992. While apparently hampered by the necessity to distill eight months of goals and objectives, as presented in the original proposal, into little over four months of actual working time once approval was received, certain accomplishments were apparent. From observations, site member reports, and school data gathered between January and June of 1992, the support for the Tech Prep initiative was established; 90% of Consortium members believe Tech Prep will help general education students and 88% of members expect positive long-term benefits from Tech Prep involvement.

Was the Consortium successful in meeting its 1991-92 goals and objectives? The Region 10 Consortium was formed to advance and expand the Indiana state adopted Tech Prep model to all secondary schools in Region 10. All Region 10 secondary schools have now been included in the Consortium and are sending representatives to training and coordination meetings. During Phase One, specific objectives included team building, characterized by such activities as monthly site visits within each individual secondary school, regional orientation sessions, and dissemination of a regional newsletter. Data collected regarding site visits indicated variation with some schools meeting monthly, one weekly, and others on an informal basis. As of May 17, 1992, one school was not meeting, however, site team members attended the June training and final planning session, becoming more involved in the Consortium. All schools received an initial orientation meeting and newsletters were mailed to all site team members, post-secondary representatives, and members of the evaluation team.

Site team members reported throughout that the opportunity to meet as a team and with other schools was beneficial. Interest in practical and specific information was also a continuing theme. Major problems either encountered or anticipated are concern for funding, getting teachers and schools involved, changing attitudes of some teachers in the school, making time for the planning activities that need to occur in the schools, and the need for better/more technology. These concerns will need to be addressed during the 1992-93 academic year.

According to site team member response, Region 10 training was valuable. In particular, the regional planning day on June 26, 1992 provided the kind of basic orientation to Tech Prep that schools desired. At the meeting, schools worked as teams to write their Tech Prep mission statement. Site teams appeared to finally coalesce as they drew on expertise from different members, working across curricula to identify the strengths and weaknesses to implementation in their individual schools. Using Tech Prep methodology, the session was applications based, adjusted to different learning styles, and was cooperative. Observing one committee with two members who have remained tentative and cautious throughout the Region 10 training sessions, the other members of the team were able to offer supportive and encouraging direction for the school. Ability to lead or facilitate team meetings has naturally evolved through the process. The Region 10 Consortium reflected the Tech Prep strategies by offering a model of implementation within the training sessions.

A strength of the Consortium was the continuous effort to develop training around the needs of the constituency. Bruce Ricklin was responsive to Consortium members when he chose to dispense (with some guidance and agreement from the Coordinating Council) with the state prepared video tape for the April 27, 1992 training session, and instead, developed an evening of training that included visitors from four of the demonstration sites. Support for the change was apparent when 94% of the site team members who evaluated the April 27 session reported it was helpful. The state video tape was made available for any member to view at another time. Also, Bruce exhibited interest in knowing Consortium

member response to training sessions and was given short reports presenting frequencies and distributions for session evaluation questions.

Although no strong weaknesses were apparent, the following recommendations might assist the 1992-93 development phase:

* Due to the shortened amount of time for Phase One, and the need to move some of the original goals to the 1992-93 year, the goals for 1992-93 will also need to be modified. In order for Consortia to actively become change agents and leaders in the Tech Prep initiative, they need an adequate length of time for such goals as team building and site ownership to occur. It is therefore, important that Regions receive earlier notification of grant approval.
* A plan should be developed to mentor or orient all new site team members as it was apparent from Phase One that membership (in most instances just one member while more than one at other schools) changed in many of the schools. The site team coordinator, Region Director, or Tech Prep Administrative Assistant could assume that role and appropriate handouts and materials could be prepared.
* The Consortium should continue to develop training that provides practical and useful information to Consortium members as requested by site team members. Responsiveness to the constituency is generally correlated with success of development activities. The Region 10 Administrative Assistant could contact schools at regular intervals to update the site team member list (although fewer changes should be anticipated for the 1992-93 year). Also, routine inquiry regarding receipt of newsletters and Consortium communique will alert the Director if members are not receiving appropriate information.
* Routine for all meetings should be a sign-in sheet (a form could be developed for this purpose) and new names appearing on the sheets could be added to the database or inquiries regarding Tech Prep interest could be made. Team building efforts would continue through this process.
* Site teams and committees could be encouraged to keep anecdotal minutes/records of their meetings as many important decisions will be made in these committees during the next phase. Information from these records could be incorporated into the Regional newsletter as appropriate.
* Site teams with members who are not supportive of Tech Prep should be observed closely for effects. School administrators may need to replace members or additional support and encouragement can be given to those members who are responsive and involved in the initiative.
* During the 1992-93 academic year, minutes from all coordinating meetings should be kept and information included in the newsletter. Consortium members should benefit from periodic and informed contact.

References

Musick, Mark D., President. 1988. Report from the SREB-(State Vocational Education Consortium Executive Committee), written in collaboration with the Southern Regional Education Board and The National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Ricklin, Bruce, Project Director. 1991. Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium (Grant Proposal). Bloomington, Indiana.

APPENDIX A

Year 1: Planning Phase - Objectives and Timeline for Region 10 Consortium

ACTIVITY	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	Jun
Disseminate press releases of Tech Prep Regional Grant	xxxx							
Convene Coordinating Council and meet quarterly to oversee project development	xxxx		xxxx		xxxx		xxxx	
Select project staff	xxxx							
Recruit formative evaluator	xxxx							
Site Team meetings	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
Business/Industry/Labor Advisory Council meetings	xxxx			xxxx			xxxx	
Regional Curriculum Committee meetings	xxxx		xxxx		xxxx		xxxx	
Regional Staff Development Committee meetings		xxxx		xxxx		xxxx		
Regional Student Services Marketing Committee meetings		xxxx			xxxx		xxxx	
Develop and implement a plan to expand Consortia membership		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
Conduct regional orientation services		xxxx						
Disseminate regional Tech Prep Newsletter		xxxx		xxxx		xxxx		xxxx
Visit demonstration sites		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	
Participate in State sponsored training		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
Develop strategies for joint training		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
Acquire input on curricula needs and competencies		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx				
Develop competency lists			xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx		
Acquire/develop labor market analysis to target growth areas				xxxx	xxxx			
Identify occupational areas for which 4-year programs will be provided					xxxx			

Identify competencies currently being taught/not taught					xxxx	xxxx		
Determine in which courses, competencies not currently taught should be incorporated						xxxx	xxxx	
Determine course sequences							xxxx	
Identify criteria, standards and procedures for student recruitment and selection		xxxx	xxxx	xxxx				
Develop a student marketing plan to include procedures for special populations					xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	
Develop a student application form for program admittance					xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	
Evaluate Project	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx

APPENDIX B
March 27, 1992 Session Evaluation Form

REGION 10 TECH PREP CONSORTIUM -
SESSION EVALUATION

NAME _____ DATE _____

---

1. Overall, do you think this session was helpful? Why or why not? (*Circle the number*)
   1 YES 2 NO

2. The "most useful aspects" of the presentation were:

3. The "least useful aspects" of the presentation were:

4. How would you rate the amount of material covered in this session? (*Circle the number*)
   1 Too Much 2 Reasonable Amount 3 Too Little

5. What information, if any, would you have liked to have received prior to this meeting?

6. Please list additional areas about which you would like to receive more information from the Tech Prep Consortium.

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

7. How could these training meetings be improved to better meet your needs?

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

APPENDIX C
Initial Site Team Questionnaire

REGION 10 TECH PREP CONSORTIUM -
INITIAL SITE TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

---

1. At this time, how would you describe your commitment to Tech Prep? Why? (*Circle the number*)
   1 Very Supportive 2 Somewhat Supportive 3 Tentative/Cautious

2. At this time, how would you describe your school's commitment to Tech Prep? Why? (*Circle the number*)
   1 Very Supportive 2 Somewhat Supportive 3 Tentative/Cautious

3. What expectations do you currently have of the Consortium? Generally, what do you anticipate as positive/negative outcomes for this year?

   Positive:

   Negative:

4. Why did you become involved with the Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium?

5. What have been the responses among teachers, administrators, and students at your high school, regarding the Tech Prep initiative?

6. In what ways do you expect the adoption of the Tech Prep model to be a smooth transition?

(OVER)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. What changes/modifications will you need to make to adopt the program?

8. How is Tech Prep similar to or different from your existing vocational/technical program?

9. Do you see yourself gaining any personal benefits as a result of participation in Tech Prep?

10. What short- and long-term impacts do you expect this program to have on the students and/or teachers in your high school?

11. At this time, do you foresee any major implementation problems for Tech Prep in your high school?

12. Overall, do you feel the Tech Prep initiative will benefit general education students in your high school? Why or why not?

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D
Site Team Questionnaire

REGION 10 TECH PREP CONSORTIUM - SITE TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE

These data will help us determine how well the Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium is meeting its goals for this current planning year.

1. I began my Region 10 Tech Prep Consortium involvement on _____ (date).

2. Please list any Tech Prep demonstration site(s) you have visited.

_____

3. Are you currently attending Tech Prep site team meetings in your school? How often do they meet?

_____

4. Have you received copies of the Tech Prep newsletter? Approximately how many copies?

_____

5. Listed below are goals of the Tech Prep Region 10 Consortium. Please rate how well (from your perspective) the objectives for this planning year are being met. *Circle the numbers and tell why in the space that has been provided.*

	VERY WELL MET				NOT AT ALL MET
	1	2	3	4	5
Building Ownership: the extent to which you have felt a sense of belonging to the Tech Prep "team"	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
the extent to which your concerns and needs have been addressed by the Tech Prep Consortium	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
Orientation: received an initial orientation by Region 10 Administration to the Tech Prep philosophy	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
received an initial understanding of the students who Tech Prep is targeting, the reasons for the program, and its general objectives	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
Training: received appropriate and beneficial training that meets your needs	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
received help to begin to develop course competencies for your school	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	VERY WELL MET				NOT ALL MET
	1	2	3	4	5
Identify: Consortium helped you identify the broad occupational areas that will be the focus of Tech Prep in your school	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				
helped identify the staff development needs and designed staff development programs to meet your school needs	1	2	3	4	5
	Why? _____				

6. At this time, how would you rate this first year of Tech Prep involvement with the Region 10 Consortium and why? (*Circle a number*)
   1 Very Successful/Helpful
   2 Somewhat Successful/Helpful
   3 Not Very Successful/Helpful
   4 Not At All Successful/Helpful

   Because:

7. At this time, how would you describe your commitment to Tech Prep? Why? (*Circle a number*)
   1 Very Supportive
   2 Somewhat Supportive
   3 Tentative/Cautious

   Because:

8. Do you feel your role/responsibilities as a member of your school Tech Prep site team have been well explained or defined? Why or why not?

9. Do you wish to continue as a member of the Tech Prep site team in your school? Why or why not? (*Circle a number*)
   1 YES
   2 NO

10. In your opinion, what should have been done to make this first year (Year 1: The Planning Phase) of Tech Prep Consortium 10 more successful?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE